Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701

Mr. George Herman
CBS News
2020 M St., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear George,

I hope you can send me two copies of the transcript of today's Schweiker show. I'd appreciate a second copy because I'd like to annotate one and have another clean for future archival use. If you can't I'll be grateful for one.

Taking it all in, and no offense but I think you have no way of knowing what this really means, I realized all over again and in a new way how difficult it is to go down the middle (I do try) and how impossible it is to inform those who inform the people whose knowledge is supposed to rule us all.

If on the basis of fact and evidence there is a longer-lasting and more severe critic of the various spookeries than I, I can't think of who it might be. Yet I have no hesitancy at all in telling you that the Schweiker report ~~ma~~ is grossly and deliberately unfair to them.

Image me defending the CIA and the FBI! But from this fabbication made up of nothing and inaccurate to boot they are entitled to defense.

If anyone asked me, which I do not expect, I'd do it, too, with specifics so detailed I'd go astray and ~~filly~~ in the names they wrongfully hid. It was nauseating to hear this man I'd respected sound off about the people's right to know while he exemplified the worst in withholding.

I suppose you read the report. "D" is well known. He is one who manufactured a story to provoke a U.S. attack on Cuba. I have a large prior file on it. As I remember the name it is Guitorres Diaz, a Guatemalan. If not perhaps one Verson. But the stuff, without wrongful deletions, has long been in my files. I'd be willing to lay money on who "A" is, that I have a long taped interview with him. AMLASH's name, Cuebela, has been known for a long time and published, including by one of your panel, the obvious beneficiary of some leaking. I'm saving A for a partly-done book. He has some spectacular connections of the past. It simply isn't true that the disciplining of FBI agents was not known and not published. What is new it the total number. I've had leaks from one. I have the same CIA files Swchweiker used. Why he suppressed that Bringuier had worked for the CIA I do not know. I know he repeated Bringuier's perjury faithfully, building that half of the non-existing case on that particular perjury. This is all really superficial. There is a major flaw. It is all irrelevant except as a shot at the agencies so cheap in the end it will redound to their benefit. For there to be relevance Oswald has to have been the assassin. Schweiker skirted this on your show and was explicit on the first page of the report in saying this was neither considered nor investigated. In fact he had suppressed evidence from me proving Oswald was not the assassin.

He decided in advance to defend the Commission and the Report. The extreme to which he carried it astounds me. You'd never know they were in charge of the investigation, the agencies their servants. And where he quotes former staff lawyers self-servingly, he never once quotes one who worked in those areas.

I'm telling you suppression was conscious and significant. And that I'd expected much more of him. But how could the pol be very strongly in support of the unelected President who was a member of that Commission and still lay a finger on it?

Thanks,